UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,950	07/08/2003	Skott C. Klebe	C0011/7007	7104

64967 7590 12/21/2006
LAW OFFICES OF PAUL E. KUDIRKA
40 BROAD STREET
SUITE 300
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER	
WORJLOH, JALATEE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3621	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/21/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/614,950	KLEBE, SKOTT C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jalatee Worjloh	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Restriction/Election requirement has been withdrawn.

2. Claims 1-42 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the secure browser program" in 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. Claim 15 recites the limitation "the secure browser program" in 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 2, 7-11, 15, 16, 21-25, 29, 30 and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication No. 2002/0071559 to Christensen et al. in view of US Publication No. 2002/0078159 to Petrogiannis et al.

Referring to claim 1, Christensen et al. disclose receiving a request from a user (see paragraph [0343] – the user, who wishes to access the data, requests the electronic data using a client computer device), and identifier for the document (see claim 2 – the data has an identifier), receiving and resolving the link at the publisher and downloading an encrypted version (see paragraphs [0291] & [0294] – the publishing house may provide a hyperlink to the publisher. Thereby a user may download the encrypted data)), requesting a decryption key for the encrypted document with the secure viewer program (see paragraph [0295]), decrypting the encrypted document (see paragraph [0297] and displaying the document content in the secure view program (see paragraph [0299] – although it is not explicitly stated that the data is displayed, the decrypted device is outputted to an output device, which inherently displays the data). Christensen et al. do not expressly disclose preparing in the content server, an email message that contains a link to the publisher, sending the email message to the recipient user wherein, upon receiving the email, the recipient user logs onto a forwarding server at the document publisher, receiving and resolving the link at the publisher and downloading a secure viewer program to the recipient user. Petrogiannis et al. disclose preparing in the content server (i.e. proponent), an email message that contains a link to the publisher (See paragraph [0093]), sending the email message to the recipient user (i.e. correspondent) wherein, upon receiving the email, the recipient user logs onto a forwarding server at the document publisher (see paragraphs [0098] – [0100]), receiving and resolving the link at the publisher and downloading a secure

viewer program (i.e. applet) to the recipient user (see paragraph [0101]). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Christensen et al. to include preparing in the content server, an email message that contains a link to the publisher and an identifier for the document, sending the email message to the recipient user wherein, upon receiving the email, the recipient user logs onto a forwarding server at the document publisher, receiving and resolving the link at the publisher and downloading a secure viewer program to the recipient user. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces unauthorized use of content (see paragraph [0007] of Christensen et al.).

Referring to claim 2, Christensen et al. in view of Petrogiannis et al. disclose the step of making the request to forward the encrypted document to the recipient user with a secure viewer running in a browser (see claim 1 above).

Referring to claim 7, Christensen et al. in view of Petrogiannis et al. disclose opening in a computer of the recipient user, a browser in response to a selection of the link by the recipient user and navigating to the forwarding server (see claim 1 above).

Referring to claim 8, Christensen et al. in view of Petrogiannis et al. disclose opening in a computer of the recipient user, a browser in response to a selection of the link by the recipient user and navigating to the forwarding server (see claim 1 above – the applet is automatically downloaded into the browser).

Referring to claim 9, Christensen et al. disclose and document identifier (see claim 2 of Christensen et al.) and downloading an encrypted version of the document (see paragraphs [0291] & [0294] – the publishing house may provide a hyperlink to the publisher. Thereby a

user may download the encrypted data. The document identifier is associated with the document, which has been download; therefore, since the document has been downloaded the identifier must have been downloaded.). Christensen et al. do not expressly disclose downloading a document identifier to the secure viewer program running in the recipient user's computer. Petrogiannis et al. disclose a secure viewer program (i.e. applet) running in the recipient user's computer. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Christensen to include the secure viewer. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces unauthorized use of content (see paragraph [0007] of Christensen et al.).

Referring to claims 10 and 11, Christensen et al. in view of Petrogiannis et al. disclose using the document identifier to request a decryption key from the forwarding server (see claim 1 above).

Claims 15 and 16 are apparatuses that comprise means for performing the step of claims 1 and 2 above; therefore, these claims are rejected on the same rationale as claims 15 and 16 above.

Claims 21-25 are apparatuses that comprise means for performing the step of claims 7-11; therefore, these claims are rejected on the same rationale as claims 15 and 16 above.

Claims 29 and 30 are computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable code thereon for performing the steps of claims 1 and 2 above; therefore, these claims are rejected on the same rationale as claims 1 and 2 above.

Claims 35-39 are computer program products comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable code thereon for performing the steps of claims 7-11above; therefore, these claims are rejected on the same rationale as claims 7-11.

9. Claims 3 –6, 12, 17-20, 26, 31-34 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christensen et al. and Petrogiannis et al. as applied to claims 1,15 and 29 above, and further in view of US Publication No. 2004/0117247 to Agrawal et al.

Referring to claims 3 and 4, Christensen et al. teach a recipient, publisher and encrypted document (see claim 1 above). Christensen et al. do not expressly disclose the link in the email message contains information identifying the sender of the email, the recipient of the email the encrypted document, wherein the information is inserted into the URL of the link to the publisher. Agrawal et al. disclose an email that contains a URL with a user email address embedded in it (see paragraph [0019]). Although Agrawal et al. do not explicitly indicate that URL is embedded with the information identifying the sender of the email and the encrypted document, the overall concept of embedded information into a URL is disclosed. Therefore, it will be obvious to use this concept and embedded any type of data including information identifying the sender of the email and the encrypted document. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Christensen et al. to include the link in the email message contains information identifying the sender of the email, the recipient of the email the encrypted document, wherein the information is inserted into the URL of the link to the publisher. One of ordinary skill in the

art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces unauthorized use of content (see paragraph [0007] of Christensen et al.).

Referring to claims 5 and 6, Christensen et al. disclose encrypted data (see claim 3 above). Christensen et al. do not expressly disclose encrypting the identifying information in the email message, encrypting the information with a public key of a public/private key pair assigned of the publisher. Agrawal et al. disclose encrypting the identifying information in the email message (see paragraph [0038] –[0040] – the encrypted code contains email address of the user). As for encrypting with the public key this is an well known step; that is, it is known in the art of cryptography to encrypt data using a public key to secure data. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Christensen et al. encrypting the identifying information in the email message. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces unauthorized use of content (see paragraph [0007] of Christensen et al.).

Referring to claim 12, Referring to claims 3 and 4, Christensen et al. teach a recipient, publisher and encrypted document (see claim 1 above). Christensen et al. do not expressly disclose logging the information in the email including the sender, the recipient and the document identifier by the forwarding server. Agrawal et al. disclose an email that contains a URL with a user email address embedded in it (see paragraph [0019]). Although Agrawal et al. do not explicitly indicate that the email is logged with the sender, recipient and document identifier, but the overall concept of embedded information into a URL is disclosed. Therefore, it will be obvious to use this concept and embedded any type of data including sender, the recipient and the document identifier. At the time the invention was made, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Christensen et al. to include the step of logging the information in the email including the sender, the recipient and the document identifier by the forwarding server. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces unauthorized use of content (see paragraph [0007] of Christensen et al.).

Claims 17-20 are apparatuses that comprise means for performing the step of claims 3-6 above; therefore, these claims are rejected on the same rationale as claims 3-6 above.

Claim 26 is an apparatus that comprise means for performing the step of claim 12 above; therefore, this claim is rejected on the same rationale as claim 12 above.

Claims 31-34 are computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable code thereon for performing the steps of claims 3-6 above; therefore, these claims are rejected on the same rationale as claims 3-6.

Claim 40 are computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable code thereon for performing the steps of claim 12; therefore, this claim is rejected on the same rationale as claim 12 above.

10. Claims 13,27, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christensen et al. and Petrogiannis et al as applied to claims 1,15, and 29 above, and further in view of US Publication No. 2002/0087661 to Matichuk et al.

Referring to claim 13, Christensen et al. disclose an encrypted document (see claim 1 above). Christensen et al. do not expressly disclose a link that maintains a count of the number of times it has been selected. Matichuk et al disclose a link that maintains a count of the number

of times it has been selected (see claim 4). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Christensen et al to include a link that maintains a count of the number of times it has been selected. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces unauthorized use of content (see paragraph [0007] of Christensen et al.).

Claim 27 is an apparatus that comprise means for performing the step of claim 13 above; therefore, this claim is rejected on the same rationale as claim 13.

Claim 41 is computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable code thereon for performing the steps of claim 13 above; therefore, this claim is rejected on the same rationale as claim 13 above.

11. Claims 14 ,28, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christensen et al., Petrogiannis et al. and Matichuk et al. as applied to claims 13, 27 and 41 above, and further in view of US Publication No. 2004/0103044 to Vandewater et al.

Referring to claim 14, Christensen et al. disclose an encrypted document (se claim 13 above). Christensen et al. do not expressly disclose the method wherein the link is a one-time link. Vandewater et al. disclose the method wherein the link is a one-time link. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclose by Christensen et al. to include a link that is a one-time link. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it reduces unauthorized use of content (see paragraph [0007] of Christensen et al.).

Claim 28 is an apparatus that comprise means for performing the step of claim 14 above; therefore, this claim is rejected on the same rationale as claim 14.

Claim 42 is a computer program product comprising a computer usable medium having computer readable code thereon for performing the steps of claim 14 ; therefore, this claim is rejected on the same rationale as claim 14 above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jalatee Worjloh whose telephone number is (571) 272-6714. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Thursdays 8:30 - 7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jalatee Worjloh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3621

December 11, 2006